

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed April 26, 2007. Claims 1-11 and 13-69 were pending in the present application (please note the typographical error on the Office Action Summary page that instead lists 1-11 and 13-64). This Amendment amends claims 1, 21, 34, 44, 51, 61, 68, and 69, without adding or canceling any claims, leaving pending in the application claims 1-11 and 13-69. Reconsideration of the rejected claims is respectfully requested.

I. Examiner Interview

A telephone interview was conducted with Examiner Tran on August 17, 2007. The undersigned attorney represented the Applicants in the interview, along with inventors Berna Erol and Jonathan Hull. In the interview, differences between the invention and the cited art were discussed. The Examiner indicated that he believed the claims to be allowable over the cited art. The Examiner also indicated, however, that he believed the claims in their current form to be too broad to show the unique and patentable aspects of the claimed invention. Applicants worked with the Examiner since this time to amend the claims in a way that the Examiner believes are not only allowable over the cited art, but are also likely to be allowable in light of another search. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's help on these matters, and have amended the claims accordingly. Applicants thus respectfully submit that the claims are allowable over the cited art, and request that the claims as amended be allowed.

II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-11, 13-15, 19, 21-29, 31, 33-42, 44-59, 61-66, and 68-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over *O'Neal* (US 2004/0113935) in view of *Nirell* (US 7,086,032). Applicants respectfully submit that these references do not teach or suggest each element of these claims. As indicated above, the Examiner has also indicated that he believes these claims to (pending a final review of the reference) be allowable over these references.

For example, *O'Neal* teaches an electronic presentation system useful with multiple screens that allows a presenter to dynamically provide annotations to the presentation (paragraphs [0005]-[0008]). A presentation interface allows a presenter to annotate that which is being projected, such as by using a touch-screen monitor to draw text boxes, diagrams, etc., which are overlaid over the video data (paragraphs [0033], [0043]). The presenter can elect to save those annotations so that when the slides or video information are played during another presentation, the annotations will be included in the presentation (paragraph [0048]). A presenter also has the option of adding a visual indicator to a presentation where the presenter wants to mark the slide for revision (paragraphs [00127]-[0129]).

Such a system is very different from that which is recited in Applicants' claim 1. The invention of claim 1 allows a user selectable object to be automatically added to an electronic representation of a document including presentation material. This can include, for example, a selectable icon being automatically added to a document including images or slides used during a presentation. The user selectable object is automatically inserted into the document when a portion of the document is found to match a portion of audio and/or visual information recorded during a presentation of the presentation material. For example, a selectable icon can be inserted into a slide document when that slide matches a portion of a video recording of a presentation. When a user views the slide document and selects the user selectable object, the user accesses and can view the corresponding portion of the audio and/or visual recording of the previously-occurring presentation.

O'Neal does not teach or suggest such functionality. *O'Neal* does not discuss recording a presentation, including audio and/or visual information, and saving the information to a recorded information file, then comparing the visual feature to the recorded information to determine a portion of the recorded information corresponding to the visual feature, and generating a user selectable object providing a user with access to that portion of the recorded information and inserting the user selectable object into the electronic representation, thus creating a composite electronic representation of the document including the user selectable object placed in a position associated with the extracted feature and allowing the user to access the portion of the recorded information in an application displaying the composite electronic

representation or a separate application by selecting the user selectable object. *O'Neal* teaches storing annotations, but these annotations are not user selectable objects in a document that allow access to audio and/or video recorded of a presentation. Further, there is no matching process and subsequent automatic insertion of such objects. *O'Neal* also teaches visual indicators for flagging a slide to be changed, but this also is not a user selectable object in a document that is automatically inserted during a matching process and provides access to audio and/or visual information recorded during a presentation. The Office Action recognizes on page 5 that *O'Neal* does not teach or suggest automatically inserting such an object. The Office Action indicates on page 4 that *O'Neal* teaches automatically locating recently annotated slides and forwarding for updating in paragraphs [0127]-[0129], but it is respectfully submitted that this process simply allows a presenter to flag slides to be updated, which can be automatically located by the system using the visual indicator added, and it does not teach or suggest comparing a feature extracted from a document to audio and/or visual information recorded of a presentation to determine a portion of the audio and/or visual information that corresponds to that feature. For at least these reasons, *O'Neal* cannot render obvious Applicants' claim 1.

Nirell does not make up for the deficiencies in *O'Neal* with respect to Applicants' claim 1. *Nirell* teaches a system for representing movement or animation to a sequence of screen shots (col. 4, lines 14-27). The presentation authoring system captures screen shots from an application program and transforms the screen shots into movies which can be played back using a browser, for example (col. 4, line 60-col. 5, line 27). In order to capture the screen shots to be used in the presentation, a user selects a button on the keyboard such as a Print Screen option (col. 5, lines 60-67). The user then can move the position of the mouse pointer, for example, and capture another screen shot (col. 5, line 67-col. 6, line 4). In another embodiment, the system captures a screen shot automatically each time a user changes focus of an active application program or otherwise presses a key of the keyboard (col. 6, lines 5-13). This is very different from that recited in Applicants' claim 1, as *Nirell* does not automatically insert a user selectable object into a presentation document when a portion of that document matches audio and/or visual information recorded during a presentation. In fact, the section discussed above and cited in the Office Action occurs during the formation of the material to be presented, and not previously

recorded audio and/or video of a presentation. Further, changing focus in an interface or pressing a "Print Screen" button on a keyboard is not equivalent to selecting a user selectable object in a presentation document that allows the user to access a corresponding portion of a separate audio and/or video information file recorded during a presentation. *Nirell* does not teach or suggest such user selectable objects automatically inserted into a document upon a match, or the ability to select the object to access the corresponding audio and/or visual information. As such, *Nirell* cannot render obvious Applicants' claim 1, or the claims that depend therefrom, either alone or in combination with *O'Neal*. Further, even if there were motivation to combine the references, the combination would at best include animation in the annotatable presentation of *O'Neal*, and would not arrive at the invention of Applicants' claim 1. The other claims recite limitations that are neither taught nor suggested by *O'Neal* and *Nirell*, for reasons including those discussed above, such that these claims also cannot be rendered obvious.

Claims 16-18, 20, 30, 32, 43, 60, and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over *O'Neal* and *Nirell* in view of *Copperman* (US 6,665,490). These claims are not rendered obvious by *O'Neal* and *Nirell* as discussed above. *Copperman* does not make up for the deficiencies in these references with respect to these claims. As discussed previously, *Copperman* teaches notetaking and other "manual annotating activities" associated with portions of a recording (col. 1, lines 53-56). In a system of *Copperman*, a user can begin "notetaking or other manual annotating activity associated with a portion of a recording" or begin playback of a portion of a recording associated with an annotating activity without stopping until an electronic file or document can be created or retrieved (col. 2, lines 11-17). The system utilizes an image input device or input circuitry to capture information about annotating activity performed by a user (col. 2, lines 18-67). Information then can be captured relating to the annotating activity and the time during the recording at which the annotation occurred (col. 2, lines 28-37). The recorded information corresponding to the time of the annotation then can be replayed by pointing to or otherwise indicating the note or annotation that was manually entered by the user (col. 6, lines 44-64; col. 13, lines 8-27).

Alternatively, Applicants' claim 1 as amended recites extracting a feature from an electronic representation of a document, such as an electronic presentation document, for example, and comparing the feature to audio and/or visual information recorded during a previous presentation to determine a portion of the recorded information that corresponds to the extracted feature. A user selectable object (such as a hyperlink or linked thumbnail image, for example) then is automatically inserted into the electronic document so that the user can access that portion of the audio and/or visual information. This allows not only that user, but any other user viewing the composite electronic document, to select any portion of the recording that might be of interest at any subsequent time. The system of *Copperman* only allows access to certain portions of the recording that correspond to notes or annotations by a particular user, which typically will not relate to the entire recording and may indicate portions different from portions of interest that a different user might indicate. A subsequent viewer of the document of *Copperman* also will not be able to access any part of the recorded portion that has a corresponding feature in the electronic document, only those portions corresponding to manually entered notes or annotation of a particular user. *Copperman* thus cannot make up for the deficiencies in *O'Neal* and *Nirell* with respect to these claims. For at least these reasons, Applicants' claims 16-18, 20, 30, 32, 43, 60, and 67 cannot be rendered obvious by *Copperman*, either alone or in any combination with *O'Neal* and *Nirell*.

Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejections with respect to claims 1-11 and 13-69 be withdrawn.

III. Amendment to the Claims


Unless otherwise specified or addressed in the remarks section, amendments to the claims are made for purposes of clarity, and are not intended to alter the scope of the claims or limit any equivalents thereof. The amendments are supported by the specification and do not add new matter.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 925-472-5000.

Respectfully submitted,



Jason D. Lohr
Reg. No. 48,163

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 925-472-5000
Fax: 415-576-0300
Attachment
JDL:slh
61105989 v1